



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,669	11/08/2005	Hesson Chung	4698-0109PUS1	9231
2252	7590	06/17/2009		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH				EXAMINER
PO BOX 747				PALENIK, JEFFREY T
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/17/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10521669	11/8/2005	CHUNG ET AL.	4698-0109PUS1

EXAMINER

Jeffrey T. Palenik

ART UNIT	PAPER
1615	20090612

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply filed on 2 March 2009 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): Applicant has not adequately replied to the Provisional Obviousness Type Double Patenting Rejection. A request to hold a rejection in abeyance is not a proper response to a rejection. Rather, a request to hold a matter in abeyance may only be made in response to an OBJECTION or REQUIREMENTS AS TO FORM (see MPEP 37 CFR 1.111(b) and 714.02).

As such, the submission filed 2 March 2009 is not fully responsive because it is not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.111(b), which states that "[i]n order to be entitled to reconsideration or further examination, the applicant or patent owner must reply to the Office action. The reply by the applicant or patent owner must be reduced to a writing which distinctly and specifically points out the supposed errors in the Examiner's action and must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. If the reply is with respect to an application, a request may be made that objections or requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of the claims be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated. The Applicant's or patent owner's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the application or the reexamination proceeding to final action. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section.

Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be bona fide, Applicant(s) is/are given ONE (1) MONTH OR THIRTY (30) DAYS from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

/Jeffrey T. Palenik/
Examiner, Art Unit 1615

/MP WOODWARD/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615